

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/753,390		01/09/2004	Kia Silverbrook	DAM03US	6102	
24011	7590	03/21/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
		ESEARCH PTY L	NGUYEN, LAMSON D			
393 DARLI BALMAIN,				ART UNIT	UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
AUSTRALÍ	Α			2861		
				DATE MAILED: 03/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	$\overline{}$
	, ,	10/753,390	SILVERBROOK, KIA	(pl
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Lamson D. Nguyen	2861	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app		orrespondence address	
	riod for Reply	·		
	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communicati D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Sta	tus			
	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
9		- action is non-final.		
•	3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits	is
•	closed in accordance with the practice under E.	·		
5	·			
Dis	position of Claims	•		
	4) Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	•
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	. •		
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.		
		1		
Ap	plication Papers			
	9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
•	10) \boxtimes The drawing(s) filed on <u>09 January 2004</u> is/are:	O O		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the c			/-IX
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti			(a).
	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ammer, Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-132.	
Pri	ority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
•	 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents)-(d) or (f).	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		on No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			
	application from the International Bureau	(PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.	
	•			
	,	·		
Atta	achment(s)			
_	☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2) [–	Paper No(s)/Mail Da		

Art Unit: 2861

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim 8 is provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 8 of copending Application No. 10/753,389. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 2861

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17, 18, and 23 of U.S. Patent No. 6,997,698. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 17, 18, and 23 of '698 anticipate claims 1-4 of the instant application.

Claims 5-7, 9-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-19 of copending Application No. 10/753,389 in view of Speakman (6,503,831).

Claims 1, 5-19 claim all claimed features of claims 5-7 and 9-19, but do not claim a layer having at least two different materials.

It is well-known in the art to eject two different materials into one layer, as taught by Speakman (figure 19, particulates 1202 and organic binder material 1208 into one layer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the invention of '389 to incorporate two material layer by Speakman for the purpose of forming an electronic device.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Art Unit: 2861

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Speakman (6,503,831).

Speakman teaches a three dimensional creation system comprising:

Claims 1, 2:

- a plurality of printheads, the system printing at least part of each layers simultaneously (figure 19 teaches two printheads 1200 and 1206 that print layers simultaneously)
- wherein the printheads are configured to enable printing of at least two different materials in at least one layer (figure 19 teaches a combined layer of particulates 1202 and organic binder material 1208)

Claim 3:

at least one first printhead for printing a first material and at least one second
 printhead for printing a second material (figure 19 teaches printhead 1206

depositing particulates 1202 and printhead 1200 depositing organic binder material 1208)

Claim 7:

the system includes a plurality of printheads (figures 1 and 19)

Claim 10:

the system is configured to enable at least one first printhead that is initially configured to print at least part of a first layer to be dynamically reconfigured to print at least part of a second layer (figure 19 teaches printhead 1206 deposits particulates 1202 first to create the first layer while ejection of organic binder material 1208 by printhead 1200)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Speakman.

Art Unit: 2861

Speakman teaches a system that prints simultaneous layers to fabricate a three-dimensional object, but does not teach 100 layers being simultaneously printed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Speakman to include 100 layers since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involve only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamson D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2259. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Talbott can be reached on 571-272-1934. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LAMSON NGÙYEN PR(MARY EXAMINER

Page 6

P/19/08